REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his comments, detailed in the present Office Action. Applicant respectfully notices that the present Office Action addresses Claims 1-13 as originally submitted, although the Response filed on 15 June 2004 included a set of amended Claims. In the set of amended Claims, Claim 11 was amended and Claims 2-4, 6, 8, and 13 were cancelled. Claims 14-19 were added.

5

15

20

25

The examiner has indicated that claims 1-13 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 12, 25-27, and 30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,362.

Applicant hereby submits a timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dasan, USPN 5,761,662, in view of Rose, USPN 5,724,567. Claims 2-4, 6, 8, and 13 have been cancelled. Claim 11 has been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that Dasan and Rose, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the present invention as claimed.

Independent Claims 1, 7, and 12 recite a method, an inspector, and/or a system comprising, *inter alia*, at least one inspector, which performs any of mathematico-logical calculations, executes computational algorithms, returns the results of system calls, accesses the contents of storage devices, and queries devices or remote computers.

As admitted in the Office Action, Dasan fails to teach or suggest at least one inspector, which performs any of mathematico-logical calculations, executes computational

algorithms, returns the results of system calls, accesses the contents of storage devices, and queries devices or remote computers, as claimed in Claims 1, 7, and 12.

Rose does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Dasan. Rose discloses a computer-based information system that enables users to access information from a variety of sources. The items of information are placed in a global database and the system delivers to the users an identification of only those items of information which are believed to be relevant to the particular user. Rose fails to teach or suggest at least one inspector, which performs any of mathematico-logical calculations, executes computational algorithms, returns the results of system calls, accesses the contents of storage devices, and queries devices or remote computers, as claimed in Claims 1, 7, and 12.

5

10

15

20

25

Furthermore, Dasan fails to teach or suggest a combination with Rose and Rose fails to teach or suggest a combination with Dasan. It would be impermissible hindsight based on Applicant's own disclosure to incorporate the teachings of Rose into Dasan in order to arrive at the present invention. Moreover, such alleged combination would still fail to teach or suggest at least one inspector, which performs any of mathematico-logical calculations, executes computational algorithms, returns the results of system calls, accesses the contents of storage devices, and queries devices or remote computers, as claimed in Claims 1, 7, and 12.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 7, 12, as well as their respective direct or indirect dependent claims, are distinguishable over Dasan and Rose, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed. Applicant also submits that Claims 14-19 are patentable as well and should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the claimed invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States Patent.

Respectfully Submitted,

10

5

Florin Corie

Reg. No. 46,244

15

Customer No. 22862